

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated July 17, 2006, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire October 17, 2006.

Claims 1-12, 17-26, 31-33, and 38-45 Are Patentable Over Hubacher

Claim 1, as amended for clarification, recites:

notifying an intelligent endpoint of a boot event for a computer system, the intelligent endpoint being connected to one of the computer systems, wherein the intelligent endpoint is a peripheral device; and
deciding on an action for the boot event using the intelligent endpoint, wherein the action may affect or depend on a boot of another computer system.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hubacher fails to teach the recited intelligent endpoint. Specifically, Hubacher teaches a server in a LAN environment that can control the boot requests from client machines to eliminate congestion on the network. Col. 2, lines 58-62. This server is clearly not a peripheral device as recited in Claim 1. As taught by Applicant in paragraph [0011], the intelligent endpoint can advantageously resolve arbitration issues in a cost- and size-efficient manner. Moreover, the intelligent endpoint can provide significant flexibility during booting to enforce the most desirable policies. The server of Hubacher fails to use a peripheral device for boots, i.e. the intelligent endpoint, or recognize its advantages. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on those reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-12.

Claim 17, as amended for clarification, recites:

a boot manager for assisting a booting platform of each of the computer systems; and
boot intelligence for storing information regarding boots of the computer systems, wherein the boot manager and the boot intelligence form a peripheral device.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hubacher fails to teach the recited boot manager and boot intelligence of the intelligent endpoint. Specifically, Hubacher teaches a server in a LAN environment that can control the boot requests from client machines to eliminate congestion on the network. Col. 2, lines 58-62. This server is clearly not a boot manager or a boot intelligence that form a peripheral device as recited in Claim 1. As taught by Applicant in paragraph [0011], the intelligent endpoint can advantageously resolve arbitration issues in a cost- and size-efficient manner. Moreover, the intelligent endpoint can provide significant flexibility during booting to enforce the most desirable policies. The server of Hubacher fails to use a peripheral device for boots, i.e. the intelligent endpoint, or recognize its advantages. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 17.

Claims 18-26 depend from Claim 17 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 17. Based on those reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 18-26.

Claim 31, as amended for clarification, recites in part:

an intelligent endpoint operatively coupled to the computer via a system fabric, the intelligent endpoint managing at least a portion of a boot of the computer, wherein the intelligent endpoint is a peripheral device.

Therefore, Claim 31 is patentable for substantially the same reasons presented for Claim 1. Based on those reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 31.

Claims 32-33 and 38-45 depend from Claim 31 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claim 31. Based on those reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 32-33 and 38-45.

Claims 13, 27, And 34 Are Patentable Over Hubacher And Cromer

Claims 13, 27, and 34 depend from Claims 1, 17, and 31, respectively, and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claims 1, 17, and 31. Cromer fails to remedy the deficiency of Hubacher with respect to Claims 1, 17, and 31. Specifically, Cromer fails to teach the recited intelligent endpoint. Because both Hubacher and Cromer fail to disclose or suggest the recited intelligent endpoint, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 13, 27, and 34.

Claims 14, 28, And 35 Are Patentable Over Hubacher And Yoon

Claims 14, 28, and 35 depend from Claims 1, 17, and 31, respectively, and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claims 1, 17, and 31. Cromer fails to remedy the deficiency of Hubacher with respect to Claims 1, 17, and 31. Specifically, Cromer fails to teach the recited intelligent endpoint. Because both Hubacher and Cromer fail to disclose or suggest the recited intelligent endpoint, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 14, 28, and 35.

Claims 15, 29, And 36 Are Patentable Over Hubacher And Davis

Claims 15, 29, and 36 depend from Claims 1, 17, and 31, respectively, and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claims 1, 17, and 31. Cromer fails to remedy the deficiency of Hubacher with respect to Claims 1, 17, and 31. Specifically, Cromer fails to teach the recited intelligent endpoint. Because both Hubacher and Cromer fail to disclose or suggest the recited intelligent endpoint, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 15, 29, and 36.

Claims 16, 30, And 37 Are Patentable Over Hubacher And James

Claims 16, 30, and 37 depend from Claims 1, 17, and 31, respectively, and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons presented for Claims 1, 17, and 31. Cromer fails to remedy the deficiency of Hubacher with respect to Claims 1, 17, and 31. Specifically, Cromer fails to teach the recited intelligent endpoint. Because both Hubacher and Cromer fail to disclose or suggest the recited intelligent endpoint, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16, 30, and 37.

Objection To Figure 1

Figure 1 is objected to because it is not labeled prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that if one of the endpoints shown in Figure 1 (e.g. one of endpoints 106, 108, 110, 111, 118, 119, and 120) is an intelligent endpoint, then Figure 1 does not show prior art. This teaching is provided in the Specification at paragraph [0038]. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Figure 1.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-45 are pending in the present application.
Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the
undersigned at 408-451-5907 to expedite prosecution of this
case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jeanette S. Harms', with a long horizontal line extending to the left.

Customer No.: 22888

Jeanette S. Harms
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,537